**Dewan.—**

Yes. Only yesterday.

**Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar.—**

Is it favourable?

**Dewan.—**

I am not prepared to answer the question.

**Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar.—**

With what credentials did Mr. Schomburg come to Mysore?

**Dewan.—**

Government were satisfied that he had credentials. They are not prepared to discuss his qualifications.

**Mr. Ananthaiya.—**

If Mr. Schomburg was considered to be an expert, what was the need for obtaining the services of a special officer from the Government of India?

**Dewan.—**

To test the data obtained by Mr. Schomburg.

**Mr. Ananthaiya.—**

Were not men competent to deal with these data available in the State?

**First Member of Council.—**

None who had experience of Coal.

**Mr. Ananthaiya.—**

Who was the expert that was deputed by the Government for this work and to what place does he belong?

**First Member of Council.—**

His name is Mr. Vinayak Rao. He is an officer of the Government of India, Geological Survey Department.

By. Mr. S. Honnappiah. (Chikmagalur Taluk).—

*Q.*—21. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) The number of bridges damaged by the floods of 1923 and 1924 with their situation, names and the estimated loss in the case of each (districtwar).

(2) Have all these bridges been reconstructed?

(3) Were the works, *i.e.*, supplying, conveying and erecting of iron girders to these bridges, given to contractors by means of tenders? If so, the number of tenders received for these works.

(4) Did any local contractors submit tenders for these works?

(5) The principle adopted in the selection of contractors to the above works.

(6) Is it a fact that the above works were given to the present contractors or contractor, even though there were local contractors available who could take up the works at lower rates?

(7) What is the rate given to supplying, conveying and erecting iron girders to Kudregundi Bridge in Koppa Taluk in the year 1924 and that allowed to the present work?

(8) What would be the savings if the rate similar to that given to Kudregundi Bridge had been allowed to the present works also?

(9) Was not the same gentleman who took up the Kudregundi Bridge available for these works also?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—

*A.*—21. (1)—

| MYSORE DISTRICT. | Amount of estimate for making the damages good. |
|---|---|
| | Rs. |
| 1. Wellesley Bridge at Seringapatam (3—78 of Madras-Cannanore Road) .. . | 20,975 |
| 2. Paschimvahini Bridge at 2—81 of Madras-Cannanore Road .. ... ... | 1,077 |
| 3. Bridge at 2—118 of Madras-Cannanore Road, Hunsur ... ... ... | 378 |
| 4. Kapila Bridge at Nanjangud in Bangalore-Nilgiri Road ... ... ... | 4,580 |
| 5. Gundlu Bridge at Nanjangud in Bangalore-Nilgiri Road ... ... ... | 3,725 |
| 6. Bridge at 4—103 of Nanjangud-Hasanurghat Road ... ... ... ... | 1,400 |
| 7. Bridge at 1—140 of Mysore-Manantody Road.. | 1,273 |
| 8. Bridge at 1—128 do ... | 286 |
| 9. Bridge at 8—136 do ... | 550 |

| MYSORE DISTRICT. | Amount of estimate for making the damages good. |
|---|---|
| | Rs. |
| 10. Bridge at 3—1 of T.-Narsipur-Chamarajnagar Road ... ... ... ... | 554 |
| 11. Bridge at 8—4 of Gundlupet-Chamarajnagar Road ... ... .. ... | 529 |
| 12. Taraka Bridge embankment in 5 and 6—18 of Hunsur-Begur Road ... ... | 1,449 |
| 13. Bavali Bridge at 7—144, Mysore-Manantody Road. (Only half cost to be borne by the Mysore State) ... ... ... | 2,220 |
| **HASSAN DISTRICT.** | |
| 14. Abbalbidu Bridge at 1—153 of Bangalore-Magalore Road ... ... ... | 12,000 |
| 15. Kadamane Bridge at 2—156 of Bangalore-Mangalore Road ... ... ... | 12,300 |
| 16. Kempahole Bridge at 1—158 of Bangalore-Mangalore Road ... ... ... | 12,400 |
| 17. Devagal Bridge at 6—159 of Bangalore-Mangalore Road ... ... ... | 12,000 |
| 18. Malayalam Bridge at 2—160 of Bangalore-Mangalore Road ... ... ... | 11,700 |
| 19. Agalahatti Bridge at 4—7 of Anemahal-Mudgere Road ... ... ... | 8,086 |
| **KADUR DISTRICT.** | |
| 20. Girder Bridge at Kudregundi, 5—32 of Tarikere-Mangalore Road, Koppa Taluk ... ... | 15,500 |
| 21. Girder Bridge at Shanavalli, 7—49 of Tarikere-Mangalore Road, Koppa Taluk ... ... | 11,050 |
| 22. Bridge at 7—40 of Tarikere-Mangalore Road, Koppa Taluk ... ... ... | 2,390 |
| 23. Bridge at 4—44 of Tarikere-Mangalore Road ... | 3,728 |
| 24. Bridge at 6—2 of Vastara-Koppa Road ... | 3,900 |
| 25. Bridge at 4—43 Do ... | 3,983 |
| 26. Kanathi Bridge at 2—16 of Vastara-Koppa Road, Chikmagalur Taluk ... ... ... | 7,575 |
| 27. Heregorija Bridge at 2—146 of Kadur-Mangalore Road, Chikmagalur Taluk ... ... | 6,545 |
| 28. Bridge at 5—22 of Kottigehar-Kalasa Road ... | 2,265 |
| 29. Bridge at 2—27 Do ... | 3,106 |
| **SHIMOGA DISTRICT.** | |
| 30. Eight bridges were damaged slightly and these required only slight repairs and almost all are completed. | |

(2) The bridges in the Kadur and Shimoga Districts have been reconstructed. Those in Hassan are under progress and will be completed during the official year. In the Mysore District, except Wellesley Bridge, which is however open to traffic, all other bridges are completed.

(3) In 1923, owing to the urgency of works, the contracts for carting and erection of girders were given out at estimated rates to local contractors and the girders were purchased from manufacturers direct and supplied departmentally. In 1924, tenders were called for by the Stores Purchase Committee and the contracts settled according to rules.

(4), (5) and (6) The Stores Purchase Committee called for tenders and settled the contract of supply and erection of girders according to rules.

(7)—

| | Per | Rate given for Kudregundi | Rate given this year |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Rs. a. p. | Rs. a. p. |
| (*a*) Supplying of girders. | Cwt. | 9 8 0 | 11 0 0 |
| (*b*) Conveying ... | 1,000 lbs. mile | 0 5 0 | 1 8 0 |
| | | (Carting being done through departmental agency as also loading and unloading paid extra) | |
| (*c*) Erection ... | Cwt. ... | 2 0 0 | 5 0 0 |

The difference in rate is due to the following reasons:—

In case of Kudregundi Bridge, it was a simple question of laying girders with wooden flooring. In the case of the present works, the whole bridge was of steel including flooring, handrails, etc., and required more time, skill and experience and necessarily a higher rate had to be paid.

(8) No comparison could be made as the designs were different in the two cases.

(9) *Vide* answer to (4), (5) and (6) *supra*.

*Supplementary Questions.*

**Mr. S. Honnappiah.**—

No reply is given to the second part of sub-division (3). I want to know the number of tenders received for these works.

**Dewan.—**

You have already been told that no tenders were called for in 1923 owing to the urgency of the works, but in 1924, the Stores Purchase Committee dealt with the question of tenders and the Government is not aware of the exact number of tenders. If the member is very particular, the information can be obtained from the Committee, but it may be stated that there is no object in furnishing that information.

**Mr. S. Honnappiah.—**

In the answer to sub-division (7), it is stated that the rate of girders for Kudregundi Bridge was Rs. 9-8-0, while that given this year was Rs. 11. Is there any difference in the quality of the steel in both the years?

**Secretary, Public Works Department.—**

The difference is in the design. As has been already stated in the case of the Kudregundi Bridge, it was simply a question of laying girders with wooden flooring, while in the other case, the whole bridge was of steel including flooring hand-rails, etc., requiring skill and experience and necessarily a higher rate.

**Mr. S. Honnappiah.—**

Were the tenders called for by the Stores Purchase Committee advertised in the Gazette?

**Secretary, Public Works Department.—**

They must have been done according to the rules.

**Mr. S. Honnappiah.—**

With regard to the answer to sub-division (1), is the amount of estimate for making the damages good complete or is there anything else?

**Secretary, Public Works Department.—**

It is a new question, but I think there is nothing else.

**Mr. Ananthiah.—**

When the Stores Purchase Committee deals with purchases and the rates for particular works, would not the whole question be placed before the Government?

**First Member of Council.—**

Not quite necessary.

**Dewan.—**

The jurisdiction of the Committee in such cases is fixed according to certain rules framed by Government.

**Mr. M. Narasinga Rao.—**

With reference to the same sub-division I, should like to know whether there were no damages in the Chitaldrug District on account of the floods.

**First Member of Council.—**

That question does not arise.

By Messrs. A. Ananthaiya, (Shimoga Taluk Constituency) and N. Gurulingappa (Honnali Taluk Constituency).—

*Q.*—22.—(1) Will the Government be pleased to state what led them to standardize Remington Typewriter in the State when no such system is in vogue elsewhere?

(2) What are the machines approved by Government for use in offices before the said standardization?

(3) Before the Remington Typewriter was selected for standardization, (*a*) did the Government call for tenders from those companies whose typewriters were on the approved list?

(*b*) How did the rates of Remington compare with those of other makes?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

*A.*—22. (1) As it was considered that the purchase by individual departments of different makes of typewriters in small numbers and at irregular intervals was uneconomical and was attended with other disadvantages, it was decided to standardise a single good make of typewriters for use in all the public offices and to effect purchases through a central agency.

(2) As many as ten makes of machines were on the approved list before Remington machines were standardised. Of these, the machines chiefly in use were the